



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/345,809	07/02/1999	DANIEL D. CHRISTENSEN	06005/35525	1692

7590

04/02/2003

ROGER A HEPPERMAN  
MARSHALL O'TOOLE GERSTEIN MURRAY & BORUN  
6300 SEARS TOWER  
233 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE  
CHICAGO, IL 606066402

EXAMINER

LEE, CHRISTOPHER E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2189

DATE MAILED: 04/02/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/345,809	CHRISTENSEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher E. Lee	2189	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Christopher E. Lee / USPTO. (3) Roger A. Heppermann (Reg. No. 37,641).  
(2) Mark H. Rinehart / USPTO. (4) Peter Cesarz.

Date of Interview: 21 March 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: Statement of Issues via FAX on 13th of March, 2003 (See Attachment).

Claim(s) discussed: exemplary claim 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: McLaughlin of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

  
MARK H. RINEHART  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

## Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

### Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

#### Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

##### Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

#### 37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case unless both applicant and examiner agree that the examiner will record same. Where the examiner agrees to record the substance of the interview, or when it is adequately recorded on the Form or in an attachment to the Form, the examiner should check the appropriate box at the bottom of the Form which informs the applicant that the submission of a separate record of the substance of the interview as a supplement to the Form is not required.

It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

#### Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed operation of invention that master Link Active Scheduler and backup Link Active Scheduler are on the same bus, but those schedulers are not within a controller, and master Link Active Scheduler updates backups after receiving. Breadth of claim did not require that management, and McLaughlin's redundant control updating was within the scope of claim language. The Examiner suggests amendment to claims to clarify structural arrangement of controllers and schedulers. Such amendment may distinguish over the prior art, but a new search would be required to consider this new issue.

**MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN**

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

6300 SEARS TOWER

233 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60606-6357

(312) 474-6300

FAX: (312) 474-0448

March 13, 2003

**FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION SHEET**

<b>TO</b>	Christopher E. Lee	Serial No. 09/345,809	
<b>COMPANY</b>	USPTO	Group Art Unit 2181	
<b>FAX NO.</b>	1 703 746 9248		
<b>PHONE NO.</b>			

<b>FROM:</b>	Roger A. Heppermann (37,641) Marshall, Gerstein & Borun	<b>EXTENSION:</b>	803
<b>PAGES (INCLUDING THIS PAGE):</b>	3	<b>CLIENT NO:</b>	06005
		<b>MATTER NO:</b>	35525
<b>PLEASE CONFIRM RECEIPT:</b>	No	<b>COUNTRY CODE:</b>	US

**MESSAGE:** Please see attached. Thank you.


*Please contact Michelle McDonald at (312) 474-6803 if you do not receive all of the pages in good condition.*

\*\*\*\*\*

*The material of this transmission contains confidential information intended only for the addressee. If you are not the addressee, any disclosure or use of this information by you is strictly prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please notify us by telephone immediately.*

06005/35525

**IN THE UNITED STATES  
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicants: Daniel D. Christensen, et al.	)	<b>CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION</b>
Serial No.: 09/345,809	)	I hereby certify that this correspondence is
Title: "An Automatically Downloaded	)	being facsimile transmitted to the U.S.
Link Active Schedule"	)	Patent and Trademark Office (Fax No.
	)	(703) 746-9248) on March 13, 2003.
Filed: July 2, 1999	)	
Group Art Unit: 2181	)	
Examiner: Christopher E. Lee	)	Roger A. Heppermann
	)	Registration No. 37,641
	)	Attorney for Applicants

**DISCUSSION TOPICS FOR TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW**

Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, DC 20231


Sir:

Applicants appreciate the telephone call from Examiner Christopher E. Lee requesting a list of topics to be discussed at the requested telephonic interview. Herein is a brief description of what the applicants would like to discuss at a convenient time for the Examiner.

The applicants would like to discuss the meaning of certain words contained in the specification and recited in the claims of the above-identified application and, specifically, the terms Link Active Schedule and Link Active Scheduler. Previous Office Actions have suggested that some confusion may exist regarding the meaning of these terms as compared to elements contained in various cited art.

Applicants believe that a telephonic interview would help clarify the distinction between the unique combination of elements within the claims, which include a Link Active Schedule and/or a Link Active Scheduler, and the specific elements disclosed in cited prior art, such as controllers and data bases, which are different in nature than Link Active Schedules and Link Active Schedulers.

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
Roger A. Heppermann  
Reg. No. 37,641

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN  
6300 Sears Tower  
233 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357  
Tel.: (312) 474-6300  
Fax: (312) 474-0448

March 13, 2003